

TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY
POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE
CLEAN WATER SERVICES WATER QUALITY LAB
9/25/03

Meeting Summary

Attendance:

Policy Steering Committee:

Kirk Andrews, Banks City Councilor
Tom Brian, Clean Water Services Chair
Jim Doane, Tualatin Valley Water District
Mark W. Eves, Lake Oswego Corporation
Herb Hirst, City of North Plains Councilor
Shirley Huffman, Hillsboro City Commissioner
Brian Moore, Tigard City Councilor
Alfredo Solares-Vega, Cornelius City Councilor
Forrest Soth, Beaverton City Councilor
Ed Truax, City of Tualatin Councilor
Lee Weislogel, Sherwood City Councilor

Consultants:

Lisa Obermeyer, Montgomery Watson
Kristen Kibler, Jeanne Lawson Associates

Clean Water Services:

Jeanna Cernazanu, Public Involvement
Coordinator
Bill Gaffi, General Manager
Tom VanderPlaat, Water Resources Program
Manager
Sheri Wantland, Public Involvement
Coordinator

Partner Staff:

Rob Dixon, City of Cornelius
Dennis Koellermeier, City of Tigard
Joe Thompson, City of Hillsboro
Rob Foster, City of Forest Grove
Gerald Kubiak, Washington County
Chris Wayland, Washington County Parks
Ed Wegner, City of Tigard
Todd Heidgerken, TVWD
David Winship, City of Beaverton
Dave Nelson, USBR
Don Stelma, USBR
Wally Otto, Tualatin Valley Irrigation Dist.

General Public:

Greg Edwards, George Dallas, Dan and Beth Irwin, Steven Petrin, Donald Stettler, Mary Brottlower,
David and Norma Kintz, Sue Marshall, Mike Pauliny, Belinda Hanley, Michael Rollins

Welcome, Introductions

Tom Brian

Tom Brian, Committee Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. He explained that the purpose of the group was to make recommendations on the key source options and provide a venue for citizen's to address all of the partnering jurisdictions. There will be a public comment period at the end of each meeting. Citizens will have 3 minutes each to speak. The Committee, staff, consultants, and audience introduced themselves.

Review of WSFS Supply Options Evaluation

Tom VanderPlaat
Lisa Obermeyer

Tom VanderPlaat gave a PowerPoint presentation about the project. Throughout the presentation, he answered questions from the Committee. The following lists the presentation topics. Questions and answers as well as expanded points not found on the PowerPoint slides are included:

Purpose and Need

Tom VanderPlaat gave a quick review of purpose and need for the study. He discussed future water supply and demand and the variety of needs of users.

Q: Has there been analysis on whether the 90% growth estimates for 2050 are from industrial/commercial or residential growth?

A: This number looks at both residential and industrial growth. It is based on each jurisdiction's 50 year water master plan.

Q: Why is the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District not a partner in this study?

A: They have the water capacity they need for the future; they own 50% of the current capacity of Hagg Lake. The irrigation district is participating in discussions, but they are not a funding partner.

Q: Can we expect global warming will affect each of the partner jurisdictions the same?

A: Yes, global warming will affect different elevations in the region differently; rainfall will be most affected.

Key Source Option Summary and Impacts

Tom VanderPlaat
Lisa Obermeyer

This is a continuation of the PowerPoint presentation. Lisa Obermeyer of MWH gave an overview of the alternatives analysis, including the options screening process, evaluation criteria, and past work of developing options. She described the following (from PowerPoint presentation):

Source Options Not Recommended for Further Study

- New in-line storage—new dam in basin
- Off-line storage for tributary flow
- Bull Run Dam #3
- Stimson Dam (**Bureau of Reclamation asked that this option be looked into further**)

Source Options to be included in All Alternatives

- Conservation
- Wastewater reuse (Tom explained that there are only certain users right now, mostly golf courses. Clean Water Services is using much of their treated wastewater to improve quality and flow of the Tualatin River)
- Aquifer Storage and Recovery
- Near-term additional supply from Portland Bull Run System

Q: How much do we know about the success of past conservation campaigns/efforts, such as PGE's showerhead, faucet, and water heater program? Can we forecast from those programs?

A: There are municipal programs in place that have shown a 20% reduction per person since the late 1980's. This is based on having a tight operating and maintenance system and new codes that encourage less water usage (smaller lot size, etc.) The TVWD has seen a 13% drop in demand since

1992 and the Portland's per capita demand has gone down since 1992, aided by public education campaigns.

Q: What about water conservation by the irrigation district?

A: The irrigation district has an underground pipeline/sprinkler system that was built in the 1970s. It is relatively efficient. The Bureau of Reclamation requires them to have a Water Conservation Management Plan. Also, there are state regulations that encourage conservation, i.e. containerized nurseries are required to recycle water.

Q: Can safety improvements and security measures increase the 9000 AF expected from Bull Run?

A: Yes, a dam raise or filtration system or new pipes from Portland could increase this number.

Source Options for Further Study

- Scoggins Dam Raise 20 feet
- Scoggins Dam Raise 40 feet
- Willamette River Irrigation Pipeline (most likely pumped into a tank near Newberg)

Tom VanderPlaat provided a map that shows Hagg Lake property impacts near the tributaries from water level and road relocation for both the dam raise options. Some have suggested the road relocation won't need to impact as much if bridges are used. Tanner Creek has the most significant impacts. Tom VanderPlaat said he believes these maps show the maximum impacts. He realizes this study puts the neighbors' lives on hold and as soon as an alternative is recommended, he wants to begin looking at the impacts.

Q: How much buffer would be required between private property owner and the lake?

A: Unknown at this time.

Q: If we are using 20' and 40' for the study, could the actual project be 27' or 31' or partial dredging? Could a combo be considered and if so, when would we consider this?

A: Numbers had to be picked to study alternatives, 20' and 40' were picked because they are significantly different. As the dam is raised, the reliability of filling the dam significantly reduces. If it is raised, the actual height may be somewhere in between 20' and 40'. This will be based on impact identification, real demand, and how much local partners are willing to pay.

Q: Is the number of feet raised based on a function of supply? Is it possible to build the dam larger, but not use/fill the reservoir until you need it?

A: Yes, height is based on a function of supply. Yes, water could be stored until you need it. Water could be spilled to improve system flow. Water could be saved for dry years.

Comment: Don't want project to have a negative impact on future flood impacts.

Clarification: One document shows the elevation of the dam at 353'. This is just the top of the dam, not the height of the maximum water level (345').

Q: Are there any legal restrictions on the Irrigation Exchange Pipeline option?

A: In NE Oregon, there has already been a swap with Columbia River water in Umatilla. Tribes in the area may need to approve. Any federal funding would require approval of Congress.

Q: If the irrigation district owns 50% of the water in Hagg Lake today, will they own 50% of the water with a dam raise?

A: No, they will own the same amount they own today. They will still own only 27,000 AF. The irrigation district has said they have adequate supply for the future. The irrigation district only uses half of their supply per year. Their amount was “over allocated” when the dam was built.

Q: What about dredging? How much sediment has been dropped since the dam was built? What would dredging yield?

A: Dredging may cause bank stabilization issues and impact to existing slide areas. Also, there would be 13 million yards of dirt that would need to be removed. There would be issues with where the material would go, endless trucks through the area, turbidity, and environmental issues. Tom VanderPlaat is working on a technical memo for the committee regarding a survey that was done in 2000. There has been approximately 500 AF of sedimentation, but this does not exceed what was originally expected. There have also been discussions with the State Department of Forestry to protect the watershed area above Hagg Lake.

Q: With the pumping for the irrigation exchange, could electricity be created to offset cost?

A: We could take a look at this.

Q: What can you tell us about the fault line?

A: Don Stelma, geologist with the Bureau of Reclamation has been working on dams for 20 years. He said there is no exposed evidence of fault movement. A 1994 study looked for displacement. The conclusion was that there has been no movement in the last half million years.

Comment: Tom VanderPlaat added that the Scoggins Dam is considered one of the safest dams in the NW and has been used as a model for other dams in the NW. Tom VanderPlaat has worked at Scoggins Dam

Comment: Mark Eves encourages that both dam raise options consider hydroelectricity in the project.

Public Review Process

Jeanna Cernazanu

Clean Water Services and the Partners are trying to take a proactive approach in working with the public; they are committed to a fair and open public process. Jeanna Cernazanu referred to the “Project and Public Review Process Update” document. This document has been updated with all of the public comment and outreach to date, including website, newsletters, fact sheets, meetings with community groups, meetings with neighbors, etc.

Also included in the materials is a letter received by Clean Water Services from neighbors opposing the 40’ dam raise and suggesting other options to consider

Staff presented at the March 5, 2003 meeting of the Tualatin River Watershed Council and asked the council to rate their degree of support for each key source option. All options received support to different degrees, with a couple members who could not support the 40 ft raise and one who could not support the Irrigation Exchange pipeline.

A summary report of the web survey was distributed to the committee. A total of 129 people took the survey. No single source option received predominant support.

Jeanna Cernazanu recommended that the committee members look at all of the comments that were received.

A schedule of next steps in the study was included in the handouts. The technical part of the study is complete. When an alternative is chosen, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process will begin.

Public Comment

Members of the public who wished to make comments were asked to fill out a card and give it to Tom Brian, Committee Chair. Tom Brian called the names from the cards and each person was allowed to speak for 3 minutes.

Greg Edwards, Property Owner

53535 SW Scoggins Valley Road

Mr. Edwards brought a map from 1967 that showed the fault line. He asked if this dam could withstand a major 5 earthquake?

He recommended the Wolf Creek watershed for additional water capacity. He said if the Water District wanted to get water out of Bull Run, they should ask Metro. He added that he liked Stimson Dam option.

Mr. Edwards is on the Tanner Creek end of the project. He said he is retired and going to build. The 40' option would affect his property.

Forrest Soth asked if the 20' or 40' foot raise made a difference to him. Mr. Edwards said he could support the 20' raise. The letter signed by 97 neighbors does not support a 40' raise. Mr. Edwards said 12 people that he presented the letter to chose not to sign the letter.

Mr. Edwards recommended Senator Wu's staff see the lake when it is not full.

(After Dan Irwin's comments) Mr. Edwards sketched his property on the board, noting a culvert on the property and potential impacts to the property. With a 40' dam raise, Mr. Edwards said he would need condemnation.

Sue Marshall, Executive Director of Tualatin Riverkeepers

She said she was inspired and pleased that this process is open to the public. She is discouraged by negative remarks about wastewater reuse. She discussed how water quality was the concern. Every new hook-up increases flow to the river. She said Medford had a good speakers' bureau program about increased water temperatures. She thinks wastewater reuse is the least impact option and allows for mitigation opportunities. Regarding a dam, she added that fish passage is an important issue and that existing problems should be addressed. She recommended that more difficult changes be made to aid in conservation efforts.

There was discussion and questions among several people about the issue of preventing future flooding and pollutants in the river and using excess water from winter to improve Tualatin River summer water quality.

Mark Eves asked if the Tualatin Riverkeepers had a position about impervious surfaces due to greater development and how that might affect flooding. Sue said flooding causes soil to be saturated, so at some point, impervious surfaces don't have an impact on flooding.

Dan Irwin, Property Owner

3420 SW Nelson Road, Gaston, OR

A 40' dam raise would flood about 4 acres of his property. He wanted to know about buffers that would be required by the Bureau of Reclamation that may have larger impacts to his property. He would like more information about the buffer, which leaves homeowners more uncertain. He suggested that when the alternative is selected, there should be a committee with homeowner representation that looks at the buffer zone issue.

There was staff discussion on when those impacts might begin to be looked at. Tom VanderPlaat said next spring they could probably talk more about property impacts. Staff thought that a committee structure including homeowner representation might be possible. However, a lot of the discussion would have to happen on a case by case basis.

Mr. Irwin added that he appreciated Tom VanderPlaat's work.

Next Steps

At the next meeting, Clean Water Services and the consultant team will have as much information as possible about the remaining issues.

The next meeting will probably be mid-November. Potential dates will be sent out to the committee. The audience was encouraged to sign up on the mailing list.

Q: Where will the money be coming from for the next phase of this project? How much will partners need to fund?

A: Wrapping up the feasibility study will take \$1.2 million. In 3-4 weeks, Clean Water Services will be going back to the water managers to develop a budget for this phase. Then they will go to the various city councils, but first, a consultant team needs to be chosen for the EIS phase of the project.

Meeting Adjourned